

REMARKS

In the Official Action of February 3, 2006, a number of claims were rejected on the cited art, and others were indicated as containing allowable subject matter, and would be allowed if suitably amended. The cover page does not appear to correctly set forth the disposition of the claims. It is believed the correct disposition, according to the detailed action, is as follows: Claims 1–3, 6–11, 13 and 16–18 were rejected; whereas Claims 4, 5, 12, 14, 15, 19 and 20 were objected to but indicated as containing allowable subject matter.

In any event, the claims have been amended in a manner which, it is believed, places them all in condition for allowance, for the reasons set forth below.

Thus, Claim 1 has been amended by revising the last paragraph to include the subject matter of Claim 4, which subject matter was indicated as allowable. It is submitted, therefore, that Claim 1 as now amended is allowable over the cited references.

Claims 2 and 3 both depend from Claim 1, and are therefore believed to be allowable with that claim for the same reasons, apart from the further features included in these dependent claims.

Claim 4 has been cancelled since its subject matter has been included in Claim 1, as noted above.

Claim 5 has been redrafted in independent form, to include most (but not all) the subject matter of Claim 1 from which Claim 5 originally depended. The Official Action indicated that the subject matter of Claim 5 was allowable.

Claims 6–10 all depend from Claim 1, and are therefore allowable with the claim, apart from the further features set forth in the respective dependent claims.

Claim 11 has been retained in its original form, notwithstanding its rejection by the Examiner on the combination of Ranoux in view of Saunders et al. In this rejection of Claim 11, the Examiner referred to the Ranoux device as a motorized syringe, but the device disclosed in that patent is not actually motorized, the Examiner relying on Saunders et al for the motorized feature. More importantly, however, the Examiner referred to Fig. 1e of Ranoux as including “a threaded shaft engageable (Fig. 1e) with said threaded sleeve for axially displacing the sleeve and the plunger fixed thereto upon the rotation of the threaded shaft”. However, the only threaded element seen in Fig. 1e of Ranoux is the screw thread 23 in the upper end of tube 21 receiving the screw thread at the lower end 24 of cylindrical tube 25 for attaching and detaching tube 21 to tube 25. Although tube 25 includes a piston 26, the operation of the piston has nothing to do with the screw thread. Clearly, therefore, Claim 11, particularly the last paragraph, defines both structure and operation which differ completely from the structure and an operation in Ranoux, Fig. 1e.

The structure and operation defined in the last paragraph of Claim 11 also clearly distinguish from Saunders et al, which includes a cam mechanism for pumping the fluid to be fed to the patient.

It is submitted, therefore, that Claim 11 is clearly allowable over the cited references.

Claims 12–18 all depend from Claim 11, and are therefore submitted to be allowable with that claim for the same reasons, apart from the further features set forth in the respective dependent claims.

Claims 19 and 20 have already been allowed.

The specification has been amended merely to conform the introductory statements of the invention, as set forth in the original specification to the language now used in the claims. Clearly, there is no question of new matter.

In view of the forgoing, it is believed this application is now in condition for allowance, and an early Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Martin D. Moynihan".

Martin D. Moynihan
Registration No. 40,338

May 31, 2006